

have heard from Wisconsin agencies who have had to let staff go, limit new patients, and who honestly don't know how they will be able to afford to operate under the IPS. This will severely hurt Wisconsin's seniors, many of whom will now have to enter nursing facilities because far fewer home health services will be available for them.

Mr. President, this was not my intention when I voted for the Balanced Budget Act last year, and I believe that we must now work to make the IPS more equitable for seniors and providers. The Medicare Home Health Equity Act will accomplish this by changing the formula on which IPS is based. The new formula would be based 75 percent on the national average cost per patient in calendar year 1994 (\$3,987) and 25 percent on the regional average cost per patient in calendar year 1995. This change would bring more equity between States and would ensure that low cost States like Wisconsin are not penalized for being efficient. Most importantly, this change will ensure that seniors in Wisconsin continue to have access to the quality home health care services they need and deserve.

Mr. President, I understand that several more of my colleagues are also working on legislation that would bring greater equity to the Interim Payment System. I am cosponsoring this legislation not only because it is good for Wisconsin and other low cost States, but also because it is my hope that by bringing attention to this issue, we can all work together to find a fair solution for all States. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue during the remaining months of the 105th Congress.●

RECOGNITION OF CHERYL POEPPING

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of all Minnesotans, I would like to congratulate Cheryl Poepping from Cold Spring, Minnesota. Cheryl was recently named the Minnesota state winner in the Citizens Flag Alliance Essay Contest. The topic of her award winning essay is "The American Flag Protection Amendment: A Right of the People . . . the Right Thing to Do."

I am submitting Cheryl's winning essay and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I agree whole-heartedly with her endorsement of the flag protecting amendment and appreciate the words she chose to convey her message. Cheryl is an outstanding young American, and I am proud to count her among my constituents. Again, I offer my sincere congratulations.

The essay follows:

THE AMERICAN FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT: A RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE . . . THE RIGHT THING TO DO

(By Cheryl Poepping)

Maj. Gen. Patrick Brady was quoted as saying, "Neither the ACLU nor the media gave us free speech—our veterans did." For over 200 hundred years Americans had the

right to protect the flag but in the cases of Texas v. Johnson in 1989 and U.S. v. Eichman in 1990 the court ended this power and stated that it was a "First Amendment right of citizens to burn flags in protest." (Goldstein 85). This allowance undermines the very thing that veterans strove for, freedom. Which is why H.J. Res. 54 was introduced by Gerald Solomona. This resolution is a constitutional amendment proposed to prohibit the desecration of the flag (Packard http.). To many the flag is not just a symbol but rather representation for all the men who died defending and supporting this country. By allowing this to continue we not only undermine 200 years of history but we also destroy patriotism and respect for the country and our veterans.

The flag is a symbol of patriotism. Sown not only for those living but those who have sacrificed to make this country what it is. The flag is "a beacon of democracy and hope in a world plagued by turmoil and depression (Packard http.)." The flag allows people to believe in the country and promotes a level of respect for everything the country stands for. Without patriotism the values of the country will decline. Many feel the greatest tragedy in flag burning is the mutilation of the values it embodies and the disrespect to those who have sacrificed for those values (Brady http.). This amendment understands that when someone desecrates the flag, such acts are perceived as attacks on patriotic self sacrifice (Presser http.).

If you went to Arlington Cemetery how many men do you think died defending a cause as noble as democracy? The answer is obvious, all of them. They did not die to protect themselves or even the ones they loved, but to protect all future generations and to ensure what this country is based on freedom. These veterans deserve the honor that defending the flag has given them. To these veterans we will be saying with the passage of the flag protection amendment that we will honor them through not allowing the desecration of the symbol they united in defense to protect. Protection of the flag comes directly from the citizens where 80% support the amendment (Presser http) stating that we as citizens feel that "You—the United States—have done a whole lot for us, and therefore we are going to do this for you, we are going to protect you against public indignity. (National Review 75)." Maj. General Patrick Brady stated that, "I hope they (the voters) will have the compassion to defer to those great blood donors to our freedom, those men and women we honor on Veterans Day, many whose final earthly embrace was in the folds of Old Glory." This quote emphasizes the importance of this symbol to our veterans and our country, displaying the need for its protection.

Many oppose the constitutional amendment saying for the first time in history they are limiting the freedoms of Americans. This is not true. It is not a dagger struck out at the first amendment, but rather a indication that popular sovereignty is vital and active in this country. This question demonstrates the struggle over what kind of country we want to be (Presser http.). The First Amendment has come to protect many ideals that when it was written it has no intention of protecting. The proposed amendment would merely clarify that the First Amendment never presupposed citizens the right to desecrate the flag (National Review 76). Flag burning is not speech. It is an act that has no association with the first amendment or what it preserves (Brady http.). In fact in the 1880's the initial flag protection acts were institutionalized and later in 1984 extended laws were enacted to safeguard our flag from intentional public desecration (Packard http.). Let it be understood that

such champions of liberty such as Earl Warren and Hugo Black expressed their opinions that flag desecration was not protected under the First Amendment (Presser http.).

Flag desecration is an act that does not represent anything wholesome or respectable about our country. We as citizens of this country now have the opportunity to amend this injustice done to us by the passage of The American Flag Protection Amendment. All responsible citizens should voice the opinion that flag desecration goes against the ideas the United States was conceived to uphold. The First Amendment was never designed to allow these grossly offensive acts to occur. This amendment would uphold the honor bestowed on those that fought for this country. It would allow the loved ones of those who died to know that this country is noble and worth sacrificing their life for. As Stephen B. Presser stated "Disrespect, division, an disunity are not characteristic of a lovable people." With the passage of this amendment we will prove not only to ourselves but also to the world that the United States does not exemplify any of these negative characteristics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Burn the Flag? Well, No." *National Review*. 9 June 1995: 75-76.

Brady, Maj. Gen. Patrick (USArmy-Ret.) "The Lost Legacy of our Veterans". <http://www.cfa-inc.org/edit11.htm>

"Dooley Votes For Constitutional Amendment on Flag Desecration." <http://www.house.gov/dooley/flagamend.html> (17 Dec. 1997).

Goldstein, Robert Justin. "This Flag Is Not For Burning." *The Nation* 18 July 1994: 85-86.

Packard, Ron. "Statement Hon. Ron Packard," <http://www.house.gov/packard/flag6-12.htm> (12 Dec. 1997).

Presser, Stephen. "Why the Flag Amendment is a Really Great Idea." <http://www.cfa-inc.org/edit10.htm>.●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the City of Roseville, Michigan, which is celebrating its 40th birthday on June 20, 1998. Residents of Roseville are justifiably proud of their community's growth throughout the last 40 years.

People have lived in the area known today as Roseville since before Michigan became a state in 1837. In its early years, Roseville was an agricultural area and its people were predominately farmers. In 1836, William Rose was appointed postmaster in the area and he established a permanent office in 1840, which he named the Roseville Post Office in honor of his father, who was a hero of the War of 1812. Thus the area received its name, though Roseville was not officially incorporated as a village until 1926.

From its humble beginnings, Roseville has grown into an increasingly attractive place to live for people moving to the Detroit area. While it had previously been considered a small suburb of Detroit, in the 1950s Roseville's population increased dramatically. In 1950, the population of the village of Roseville was 15,816. By 1960, more than 50,000 people called Roseville home. In